Elite Power Dynamics

A Foundational Theory

The Few, the Many, and the Mechanism That Never Changes

History is a graveyard of aristocracies.
— Vilfredo Pareto, The Mind and Society (1916)

Thomas J. Bryan

I. The Claim

Every organized human society in the historical record has been divided, at minimum, into two groups: those who direct and those who are directed, those who extract and those who are extracted from, those who define the terms of social reality and those who live inside the terms defined for them. The names for these groups vary enormously across time and culture. Pharaoh and peasant. Lord and serf. Capitalist and proletarian. Party and masses. Clergy and laity. The vocabulary is always local, always embedded in the specific mythology the era uses to make its arrangements seem natural and inevitable. But beneath the vocabulary, the structure has remained constant across every economic system human beings have devised, every technology they have developed, every religion they have erected, every revolution they have conducted against the arrangements that preceded them.

This paper proposes a name for that structure and a framework for analyzing it. The name is Elite Power Dynamics. The framework rests on a claim that is simple to state and difficult to accept: that the fundamental problem of organized social life is not capitalism, not feudalism, not theocracy, not any particular economic system or

ideological formation, but a specific dynamic by which small groups seize and maintain control over large populations through the combined operation of three instruments—legal frameworks, information control, and organized force—and use that control to extract material resources and compliance from those populations while insulating themselves from the same extraction they impose on others.

The claim has a corollary. Economics does not drive this dynamic. Economics is one of the forms it takes, one of the clothing styles in which it appears at any given historical moment. Technology does not drive it either. Technology amplifies the instruments, extends their reach, accelerates their operation—but it does not change the structure of the operation itself. Ideology does not drive it. Ideology is the vocabulary through which the dynamic narrates itself to the population it governs. What drives the mechanism is something more fundamental than any of these: the basic organizational asymmetry between a small group that is coordinated and a large population that is not, combined with the accumulation of control over coercive capacity, definitional authority, and informational resources in the same hands.

To say this is to say something that cuts across every existing political tradition. Marxism has an account of this dynamic but insists that it is produced by capitalism; abolish capitalism and the dynamic dissolves. That is not what happened when capitalism was abolished. Liberalism has an account of rights and institutional design but tends to mistake the formal existence of democratic procedures for genuine dispersal of power; that too fails against the historical evidence. Conservatism treats hierarchy as natural and therefore beyond analysis rather than as a mechanism to be examined. Anarchism sees the dynamic clearly but has no adequate theory of how to prevent it from reconstituting itself once existing structures are removed. The framework proposed here is not aligned with any of these traditions, borrows selectively from several of them, and argues that all of them are describing parts of the mechanism while mistaking the part for the whole.

II. Defining the Elite

The word “elite” carries a great deal of baggage that the framework needs to shed immediately. It does not mean the most talented. It does not mean the most educated. It does not refer to any specific ethnic, religious, or national group. It is not hereditary by definition, though hereditary transmission of elite position is one common form the phenomenon takes. “Elite,” as used here, is a functional description, not a moral or cultural judgment: the group that does not labor yet lives lavishly, while the many labor and live austerely.

The gap between those two conditions—lavish extraction on one end, austere labor on the other—is not accidental. It is not the natural outcome of differential talent or the just reward for differential contribution to social welfare. It is the product of the mechanism: of legal frameworks that protect the elite’s claim to resources they did not produce, of information infrastructure that makes that claim appear natural and just, and of force that enforces it against those who dispute it. The gap exists because the mechanism produces it and maintains it.

The elite is not a permanent group. This is one of the framework’s most important distinctions, and one of the places it most sharply diverges from theories that make the specific identity of the dominant group central to the analysis. The personnel at the top change. Pareto called this the “circulation of elites” and stated it with characteristic bluntness: history is a graveyard of aristocracies because every dominant group eventually loses its cohesion or faces a challenger with better organizational capacity or a more compelling legitimating narrative and is replaced. The French monarchy was replaced by a bourgeois republic. The Romanov autocracy was replaced by a Bolshevik party. The colonial administration of India was replaced by an independent Indian state. In each case, the personnel at the top changed. In each case, the mechanism through which the top maintained its position was reproduced. The group changes. The dynamic does not. This is the central observation the framework is built to explain.

What defines membership in the elite at any given historical moment is not blood or culture or ideology but functional position: control over the three instruments through which the mechanism operates. Those who jointly control the legal framework, the information environment, and the apparatus of organized force—whatever they call

themselves, whatever economic language they use to justify the arrangement—are the elite. Those who provide the labor that generates the resources the elite extracts are the many. The line between them is not always sharp. There are always intermediate layers: the bureaucrat who serves the elite but is not of it, the middle manager who enforces the extraction without directly benefiting from it at the top rate, the priest who believes sincerely in the theology that happens to serve the ruler's interests. These intermediate layers are themselves part of the mechanism—the elite cannot operate without them—but they are not its core.

III. The Three Instruments

The dynamic operates through three instruments that are always present, always coordinated, and always mutually reinforcing. No single instrument is sufficient. All three together constitute the mechanism. When we look for these instruments across vastly different historical periods and economic systems, we find them operating in recognizably similar ways—which is the primary evidence that the framework has identified something structural rather than contingent.

Legal Frameworks

Law is not a neutral system for adjudicating competing claims according to abstract principles of justice. Law is the formal encoding of what the group that controls the state apparatus permits, requires, and prohibits. Its content at any moment reflects the interests of the group with sufficient power to write it. This does not mean that law never protects ordinary people; it means that law protects ordinary people insofar as and to the degree that such protection is consistent with maintaining the power of those who wrote it. The moment those interests diverge, the law reveals its actual function.

The clearest demonstrations of this come from moments when the gap between the stated principle and the actual function becomes impossible to ignore. The English Parliament passed the Statute of Labourers in 1351, within two years of the Black Death, precisely because the decimation of the workforce had given surviving workers genuine bargaining power for the first time in generations. The statute criminalized demanding

wages above pre-plague rates. The men who wrote this law were the landlords whose workers were making those demands. The law converted the landlords' preference into a legal obligation, which converted their workers' self-interest into criminal conduct, which converted violence against those workers into enforcement of the law.

The Founding Fathers of the United States gathered in Philadelphia in 1787 and drafted a Constitution specifying in remarkable detail the mechanisms for protecting private property. It said nothing about the rights of the enslaved people who were the largest single category of private property in the country. The framers did not perceive a contradiction because they were not writing a document about abstract human rights; they were writing a document about the protection of their class interests, in the vocabulary of abstract human rights. The Soviet Politburo in 1930 passed resolutions authorizing the deportation of millions of peasants to Siberian labor camps—a law written by men who controlled the apparatus and directed against people who resisted losing the land the revolution had promised them. Three legal frameworks, three centuries apart, three entirely different economic systems, one function: the conversion of a power relationship into a legal obligation.

What the legal framework accomplishes is the transformation of coercion into compliance, and the transformation of violence against resisters into enforcement of the law. This transformation is not cosmetic. It is the mechanism's most important first move, because it makes the exercise of power legible as justice rather than force, and it makes resistance to power legible as criminality rather than self-defense. Once that transformation is achieved, the population that enforces the law on behalf of the elite—the police, the courts, the army when required—can do so in the genuine belief that they are maintaining order and protecting society rather than serving a specific group's extraction interests. The genius of the legal instrument is that it recruits the population into its own governance.

Information Control

The legal framework defines the categories. The information apparatus populates those categories with specific people in the eyes of the population whose acquiescence the

mechanism requires. This is the second instrument, and in some ways the most fundamental, because it operates upstream of everything else. Before the law can be enforced, the population must believe the enforcement is legitimate. Before the violence can be directed at a target, that target must be moved outside the moral community—the circle of people whose suffering registers as suffering—through the labeling operation that the information apparatus performs.

Information control does not require censorship alone, though censorship is a standard tool wherever elites have the capacity to deploy it. The mechanism operates through the saturation of the population's informational environment with the elite's preferred account of social reality. In ancient Egypt, this saturation worked through temple iconography, ritual performance, and monumental architecture. The pharaoh was depicted as larger than all other figures, standing adjacent to gods, crushing enemies under his feet. The illiterate farmer working the Nile Delta could not read, but she moved through a built environment whose every surface communicated the same message about who held power and why that power was legitimate, necessary, and cosmic in its foundations. There was no alternative surface to read, no other information environment to inhabit. The message was not argued; it was assumed as the background condition of existence.

In the medieval Christian world, the saturation happened through the liturgical calendar, the sermon, the architecture of the cathedral, and the centrality of the priest as the sole legitimate interpreter of divine will. In the modern world it happens through the ownership structure of media, the design of educational curricula, the framing conventions of journalism, and the algorithmic structures that determine what information reaches which people in what sequence. The specific mechanism of saturation changes with the available technology. The function—making the elite's account of social reality the default account, the one that requires no argument because it is already present as the background of all thought—remains constant.

The specific content of the information apparatus is always drawn from the moral vocabulary that the target population already finds compelling. This is not incidental. The mechanism does not manufacture moral frameworks from nothing; it captures

existing ones and redirects them toward the service of elite power. Divine right worked because the populations of medieval Europe genuinely believed in the divine order of the cosmos. The dictatorship of the proletariat worked, where it worked, because the populations of early twentieth-century Russia genuinely experienced capitalist exploitation as real and unjust. Nationalism works because people genuinely identify with the collectivities their national identity names. The mechanism is always parasitic on real experience and real feeling. That is precisely why it is so difficult to see from inside. The story the mechanism tells always contains a core of truth, wrapped around the interest it actually serves.

The labeling operation is the information apparatus's most important specific function. Before the legal framework can be mobilized against a population, that population must be given a name that places it outside the moral community—that transforms people into a category, and the category into a problem requiring the solution the elite has already decided to apply. Heretic. Witch. Vagrant. Kulak. Counter-revolutionary. Criminal. Terrorist. The label is always drawn from the audience's existing moral vocabulary; the labeled group is always assigned characteristics that activate genuine fear or disgust. The label precedes the blow. Always. This sequence—label, then law, then force—is the mechanism's operational signature across every case the framework has examined.

Organized Force

The third instrument is the most direct and the most fundamental in the final analysis. Everything else—the legal framework, the information apparatus—is ultimately underwritten by the capacity and willingness to apply organized violence to those who refuse compliance after the other instruments have done their work. This capacity is what separates the state from every other organized entity in society. Max Weber defined the modern state as the institution claiming the monopoly on legitimate violence within a given territory. What the framework here adds is the observation that this monopoly has existed in every organized society, under every name, within every economic system, and that the claim to legitimacy is always produced by the first two instruments rather than being a prior fact about the state's right to exist.

Force operates most efficiently when it is invoked rarely. A mechanism that requires constant physical coercion of the entire population is expensive, unstable, and prone to collapse. The ideal operation of elite power is one in which the legal framework and the information apparatus do most of the work, leaving force as the instrument of last resort for those who see through the other instruments or refuse to comply with them regardless. The efficiency of the mechanism is directly proportional to the degree to which the governed population internalizes the elite's account of social reality and regulates itself accordingly. The peasant who works because she believes the harvest is owed to the temple costs the mechanism nothing. The peasant who works only because a soldier stands over her costs the mechanism enormously—in soldiers, in attention, in the constant risk that the soldier will be overwhelmed.

When the other instruments fail—when legal definitions are contested, when the information apparatus loses credibility, when enough people begin to see the mechanism clearly—force moves from background to foreground. This transition is always accompanied by the acceleration of the labeling operation: the information apparatus works overtime to place the resistant population outside the moral community before the force is applied, so that the violence reads as enforcement and protection rather than terror. The dehumanization campaign precedes the atrocity. The atrocity reads as consequence, not policy. This is not an accidental relationship. It is the mechanism's standard operating procedure.

IV. What Actually Drives the Dynamic

The three instruments describe the mechanism. They do not explain why it exists and why it persists across such enormous variation in human social organization. The explanation requires a prior question: what is the mechanism for?

The answer is extraction—the transfer of resources from those who produce them to those who do not. Every known instance of elite power, across every economic system and every historical period, involves this transfer. The specific form varies: grain requisitioned by the temple, feudal dues paid in kind, surplus value extracted through

the wage relationship, collective farm output appropriated by the Soviet state. The specific mechanism of transfer varies: legal obligation, market transaction, outright seizure, ideological compliance. But the directional flow of resources—from many to few, from those who labor to those who do not—is constant. It is constant because it is the purpose.

The elite maintains its position precisely because it controls the instruments that protect the extraction and because the extraction provides the resources to maintain the instruments. This loop is self-reinforcing and self-perpetuating. Control of the legal framework allows the elite to define ownership of resources in its favor. Control of the information apparatus allows the elite to make that definition appear natural and just. Control of organized force allows the elite to enforce the definition against those who contest it. The resources extracted fund all three instruments. The instruments protect the extraction. The loop closes. It opens again only when a challenger achieves sufficient organizational capacity and legitimating narrative to break it—at which point the loop closes again around the challenger.

This is why the mechanism persists through revolutionary change. The organizational capacity and ruthlessness required to overthrow an existing elite are precisely the capacity and ruthlessness that produce a new elite. The Bolsheviks were an exceptionally disciplined political organization—that is what allowed them to seize power in 1917. It is also exactly what made the Bolshevik party capable of becoming the mechanism's new operator once power was seized. The revolution against extraction produced the apparatus of new extraction. The revolution against information monopoly produced a new information monopoly. The revolution against organized force produced a new monopoly on organized force that was deployed against the population with greater systematic efficiency than the Tsarist predecessor it replaced. The clothing changed entirely. The mechanism did not change at all.

V. Why Economics Is Not the Driver

Karl Marx identified the mechanism's economic dimension with extraordinary precision. His account of how surplus value is produced through the wage relationship, how the capitalist state functions to maintain the conditions under which capital accumulation is possible, how the legal and ideological superstructure serves the interests of the class that controls the economic base—these analyses remain durable. The error was in the causal claim: that the mechanism is produced by the economic base, such that changing the base would dissolve the mechanism.

The twentieth century conducted this experiment at enormous scale and cost. Every major Marxist revolution—Russia, China, Cuba, Vietnam, Ethiopia, Cambodia—produced, within a generation, a dominant group that extracted surplus from a subordinate population, controlled the information apparatus, maintained a monopoly on organized force, and used legal frameworks to enforce all of the above. The clothing was different: class enemy rather than criminal, five-year plan rather than profit motive, party discipline rather than market competition. The structure was identical. Milovan Djilas, a Yugoslav partisan commander who became one of Tito's closest associates before becoming a dissident, named it in 1957: the communist revolution conducted to abolish classes had produced a new class. The political bureaucracy—party officials, administrators, military officers, security functionaries—collectively controlled the means of production through political authority rather than legal title, and extracted privilege from that control with a thoroughness that would have been recognizable to any feudal aristocrat.

The Soviet nomenklatura—approximately three million people out of a population of hundreds of millions—occupied a material world of dachas, special stores stocked with Western goods unavailable to ordinary citizens, dedicated hospitals, personal automobiles, elite education for their children, and separate graveyards. They did not own this world in the legal sense; title was vested in the state. They controlled it, which is the operative form of ownership. Political power converted to economic privilege through the party appointment system—the nomenklatura in its technical sense, the list of positions vetted and approved by party committees. Control the appointments, you control the economy. Control the economy, you control the material conditions of

everyone. Control the material conditions of everyone, you control the terms on which people survive and flourish. The mechanism is complete. The economic label on the box says “socialism.” The contents are the same contents that have been in every version of the box across human history.

The conclusion is not that economics is irrelevant to the analysis. It is that economics is one dimension of the mechanism rather than its driver. The specific economic system—who formally owns the means of production, how prices are set, what the wage relationship looks like—determines the specific form the extraction takes and the specific vocabulary through which it is legitimated. What it does not determine is whether extraction happens, whether the three instruments operate in coordination to enforce it, or whether the dynamic of few-over-many reproduces itself when the system changes. Those are determined by the structure of the mechanism itself, which predates capitalism by several thousand years and has shown no tendency to dissolve when capitalism is replaced.

VI. Why Technology Is Not the Driver

Every major technological development in human history has been adopted by the group that controls the mechanism and deployed in the service of that control. Writing was invented in Mesopotamia in the service of the palace and the temple—the earliest surviving texts are administrative records and royal inscriptions, ledgers of tribute and hymns to the divine legitimacy of kings. The printing press democratized access to written material and within a generation states and churches had established licensing regimes, censorship offices, and legal frameworks that controlled what could be printed and circulated. The telegraph and the railroad allowed centralized states to project administrative and coercive authority into territories that had previously been beyond effective reach. The internet was supposed to dissolve elite information monopolies permanently; within two decades, the largest concentrations of informational power in human history had consolidated in the hands of a small number of platform companies, and state actors had developed sophisticated capacities for deploying those platforms in the service of the information management the mechanism always requires.

This is not a counsel of despair about technology. It is a description of a pattern that must be understood before any specific technology can be evaluated for its actual effects on the distribution of power. The relevant question is never what a technology makes possible in principle—every technology makes many things possible in principle—but who has the capacity to deploy it at scale, in whose interest the deployment occurs, and what legal and organizational structures shape the terms on which ordinary people access it. A technology formally available to everyone but practically deployed in the service of the mechanism's three instruments changes the efficiency of the mechanism without changing its structure. The medium changes. The message—a small group controls the information environment, the legal framework, and the means of force, and extracts resources from everyone else—does not.

The current period illustrates this with unusual clarity. Digital communication technology has genuinely dispersed certain capacities: more people can publish, organize, and access information than at any previous point in history, and this has enabled forms of horizontal solidarity and rapid political mobilization that the mechanism must now account for. But the same technology has also enabled surveillance at scales no previous apparatus could approach; targeted delivery of information—including disinformation—with a precision no previous propaganda apparatus could match; concentration of the revenues of the attention economy in a small number of firms whose cooperation is required for meaningful participation in digital public life; and algorithmic shaping of the informational environment of billions of people in ways those people cannot observe or contest. The instrument is new. The function is as old as the first priest who claimed exclusive access to divine will and the authority to interpret it.

VII. Why the Mechanism Persists

The persistence of the mechanism across such vast variation in economics, technology, geography, and culture requires explanation. Three factors account for it, and they reinforce each other in ways that make the mechanism extraordinarily difficult to break once it is established.

The first is organizational asymmetry. The elite is small enough to coordinate, to communicate, to develop and execute strategy, to maintain consistent messaging, and to act with unified purpose. The mass is large enough that coordinating it requires extraordinary sustained effort and organizational infrastructure—precisely the infrastructure the elite, because it controls the mechanism, has both the incentive and the capacity to prevent from developing. Gaetano Mosca put this plainly in 1896: the organized hundred will always defeat the disorganized thousand. This asymmetry is structural and self-reinforcing. The mechanism gives the elite the resources to maintain the asymmetry, and the asymmetry makes the mechanism difficult to break.

The second factor is the internalization of the elite's account of social reality by the population it governs. Antonio Gramsci called this hegemony: the condition in which the dominant group's worldview becomes the common sense of the whole society, reproduced not through visible imposition from outside but through the invisible acceptance of a framework that structures thought before thought begins. When the peasant farms the lord's land because she genuinely believes the lord's ownership is divinely ordained, the mechanism runs without friction. When the worker accepts poverty wages because he has genuinely internalized the idea that the market has assigned him that value, the mechanism runs without friction. The information apparatus, at its most effective, does not merely suppress alternative accounts of reality. It prevents alternative accounts from being formulated, because the population has no conceptual resources outside the framework the apparatus has provided. Egyptian scholars have observed that there were revolts in pharaonic Egypt, but no revolutions: people could resist specific grievances, but they could not formulate a challenge to the institution of kingship itself, because the entire available vocabulary was one in which kingship was the precondition of cosmic order, not a political arrangement that could be otherwise.

The third factor is that those who break the mechanism tend to reconstitute it. Robert Michels named this the iron law of oligarchy in 1911, a decade before the Russian Revolution: every organization, however democratically constituted at its founding, develops a leadership layer that accumulates disproportionate power, information, and

decision-making authority. The tendency is not iron in the sense of being mathematically inevitable—there are historical instances of genuine power dispersal and genuine accountability. But it operates constantly, and only active and sustained institutional design specifically intended to counteract it prevents the tendency from prevailing. The revolutionary moment, which demands urgency and hierarchy and the concentration of decision-making in those with the best information and the most commitment, is precisely the moment least suited to building the patient accountable structures that prevent reconstitution. Every revolution has had good reasons to defer that work until after the crisis. The crisis never ends. The work never gets done. The mechanism reconstitutes.

VIII. Where Existing Theories Fall Short

Several existing intellectual traditions have identified pieces of what the framework here describes. The value of stating the framework explicitly is to show how the pieces fit together—and to draw out the implication that none of the existing traditions, taken alone, offers an adequate account.

Classical elite theory—Mosca, Pareto, Michels—correctly identifies the persistence of minority rule across different political systems and the organizational dynamics that produce it. The Mosca observation about the organized hundred and the disorganized thousand; the Pareto insight that every ruling class contains both those who rule through persuasion and those who rule through force, and that the circulation of elites replaces one dominant group with another without changing the structure of domination; the Michels iron law of oligarchy; these are genuine and durable contributions. The limitation of classical elite theory is its tendency toward fatalism. If elite domination is an iron law of organizational life, what follows? These theorists diagnosed the problem and drew from the diagnosis a conservative conclusion: attempts at fundamental transformation are naive, and the best available politics is the management of elite competition. The framework here accepts the empirical observation that elite domination is persistent and recurrent while rejecting the conclusion that it is therefore inevitable or beyond analysis and resistance.

Marxism correctly identifies the extraction dynamic and its economic dimension, and correctly insists that the legal framework and the information apparatus serve the interests of the dominant class. Its limitation is the causal priority assigned to economics—the argument that changing the economic base dissolves the superstructure—and the consequent failure to develop a theory of how power reproduces independently of any specific economic form. Rosa Luxemburg saw the problem in 1904, before the Russian Revolution, when she warned that Lenin's organizational model would produce an intellectual elite hungry for power with no mechanism of genuine accountability to the workers it claimed to represent. Leon Trotsky saw the problem in 1904 and described it exactly: "the organization of the party takes the place of the party itself; the Central Committee takes the place of the organization; and finally the dictator takes the place of the Central Committee." Both were subsequently consumed by the mechanism they had correctly described, because neither had a theory adequate to stopping it. A theory of how capitalism exploits is not the same as a theory of how power reproduces.

Liberal democratic theory correctly identifies the importance of institutional design in constraining elite power—the separation of powers, the rule of law, checks and balances, freedom of the press. Its limitation is the tendency to mistake formal institutional existence for genuine constraint. Democratic elections do not mean that the elected government is meaningfully accountable to the electorate if the three instruments—the legal framework, the information environment, and organized force—have been captured by interests that the electoral system does not adequately represent. Formal democracy and substantive elite power coexist routinely. The Constitution exists. The mechanism operates within it. C. Wright Mills documented this for mid-twentieth-century America in 1956 and his documentation has become more rather than less relevant in the decades since: the interlocking of political, military, and corporate leadership into a power elite that makes decisions outside and above the formal democratic process is not a deviation from the constitutional design but a systematic consequence of the failure of that design to constrain the concentration of the three instruments.

What the Elite Power Dynamics framework adds is the insistence on the mechanism as the primary object of analysis, cutting beneath the variables that other frameworks treat as primary. Ask not what economic system a society uses: ask who controls the legal framework and in whose interest it operates. Ask not what ideology a society professes: ask what the information apparatus does to maintain the population's acceptance of the existing distribution of resources and compliance. Ask not what political institutions a society has: ask whether those institutions genuinely constrain the concentration of coercive capacity, definitional authority, and material extraction in the same small group. These questions will be more revealing than any analysis of economics, ideology, or institutional form alone—and they will be equally applicable across the full span of human history, from the first Mesopotamian city-states whose literature was inseparable from palace and temple administration, to the digital platform companies that now control the information environment of billions of people.

IX. What This Means

If the framework is correct—if the mechanism is the constant and economics, ideology, and technology are variables—then several implications follow for how to think about political change and what kind of change is worth wanting.

The first implication is that the question "capitalism or socialism?" is the wrong question, or at best a second-order question. Both systems have been operated through the mechanism. Both have produced dominant groups that extracted surplus from subordinate populations while controlling the information environment and maintaining a monopoly on organized force. The right primary question is not what economic system a society nominally operates under, but whether the three instruments of the mechanism are genuinely constrained and genuinely accountable regardless of economic form. A capitalist economy with genuine democratic accountability, free information flows, and meaningful legal equality is preferable to a socialist economy in which a party apparatus controls all three instruments without constraint. The reverse is equally true. The economic label is secondary. The distribution of real power over the three instruments is primary.

The second implication is that revolutions—understood as the violent overthrow of the existing dominant group—are likely to reproduce the mechanism rather than dissolve it, unless the revolution simultaneously builds replacement structures with genuine accountability. This has almost never happened. The organizational requirements for overthrowing a ruling group are precisely the requirements for becoming a new ruling group, and the urgency of the revolutionary moment consistently overrides the patient institutional work of building accountable power. Every revolution has promised to be the last one necessary. Every revolution has produced conditions that made the next one necessary. This is not because revolutionaries are hypocrites or power-hungry by nature—Luxemburg and Trotsky were genuinely committed to the liberation they were fighting for. It is because the mechanism reconstitutes around whatever organizational form is most capable of exercising the three instruments, and revolutionary organizations are by design maximally capable of exercising them.

The third implication is that the work of constraining the mechanism is perpetual and unglamorous. It does not culminate in a revolutionary moment after which the problem is solved. It consists of the continuous maintenance of institutions that check executive power, the continuous defense of information environments in which accurate description of how power operates can circulate and be believed, the continuous pressure to make the legal framework operate in the interest of the governed rather than the governing, and the continuous vigilance against the reconcentration of the three instruments in the same hands. This work is never finished because the tendency toward reconcentration never stops. The pressure is constant. The defense must be constant. Every generation that fails to understand what it is defending allows the mechanism to advance.

The fourth implication is the most fundamental: the problem must be named at the right level. Naming it “capitalism” is naming it at the wrong level—too specific, too historically contingent, too susceptible to the response that a different economic form will dissolve it. Naming it “corruption” or “bad leaders” is naming it at a level that is too shallow—individual moral failure rather than structural mechanism, susceptible to the response that better leaders will fix it. The name proposed here—Elite Power

Dynamics—names the mechanism at the right level: the structural dynamic through which the few maintain extraction from the many through legal definition, information control, and organized force, regardless of what those few call themselves, what economic system they operate within, and what technology they use to amplify the three instruments.

Naming the mechanism does not dissolve it. Understanding it does not automatically produce the political will to constrain it. But it is the precondition for seeing it—and seeing it clearly, without the vocabulary the mechanism provides for its own concealment, is the precondition for anything else. Most political argument takes place inside the framework the mechanism has constructed for the population's use: arguing about which party is better, which economic policy is more efficient, which leader is more trustworthy, which ideology is more just. These arguments are not meaningless, but they are insufficient, because they take place at the level of the mechanism's surface rather than at the level of the mechanism itself.

The surface changes constantly. The mechanism does not. That is the claim. The papers in this series are the evidence for it.

A Note on Method

The papers that constitute this series apply the framework developed here to historical case studies across a wide range of periods, geographies, and economic systems: the construction of the Hebrew covenant as a political instrument across eight centuries of Judean history; the Islamic turn in Sudan and the Bashir regime's deployment of religious infrastructure; the Abbasid suppression of Manichaeism; the Soviet dekulakization campaign; the American legal system's production of racial categories; and others. The consistent finding is that the three-instrument mechanism operates in recognizably similar ways across cases that are utterly different in their surface content. That uniformity is not coincidental. It is the primary evidence that the framework has identified something genuinely structural—prior to the specific forms it takes in any given historical moment—rather than a pattern imposed by the analyst.

The method is comparative and historical, and it reads sources against the grain. Texts, laws, and official accounts produced by the groups that operated the mechanism are read not as neutral descriptions of historical events but as products of the mechanism's information management operation. This does not mean dismissing them as useless fabrications. It means recognizing that they are primary evidence not of what happened, but of what the elite that produced them needed the population to believe about what happened. The gap between those two things is where the mechanism becomes visible. It is in that gap that this framework works.

Sources and Further Reading

On classical elite theory: Gaetano Mosca, The Ruling Class (Elementi di scienza politica, 1896; English translation McGraw-Hill, 1939). Vilfredo Pareto, The Mind and Society (Trattato di sociologia generale, 1916; English translation Harcourt Brace, 1935). Robert Michels, Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy (1911; English translation Dover, 1959). James Burnham, The Managerial Revolution (John Day, 1941). For the twentieth-century American tradition, C. Wright Mills, The Power Elite (Oxford University Press, 1956) and G. William Domhoff, Who Rules America? (McGraw-Hill, 1967, periodically updated).

On power as independent of economic base: Max Weber, Economy and Society (Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft, 1922; English translation University of California Press, 1978). Michel Foucault, Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison (1975; English translation Pantheon, 1977). Antonio Gramsci, Selections from the Prison Notebooks (written 1929–1935; English translation International Publishers, 1971). Charles Tilly, Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990–1990 (Blackwell, 1990).

On the failure of Marxist revolution to dissolve the mechanism: Milovan Djilas, The New Class: An Analysis of the Communist System (Harcourt Brace, 1957). Leon Trotsky, The Revolution Betrayed (1936; English translation Doubleday, 1937). Rosa Luxemburg, The Russian Revolution (written 1918; published in Rosa Luxemburg Speaks, Pathfinder, 1970) and Organizational Questions of Russian Social Democracy

(1904). Mikhail Voslensky, Nomenklatura: The Soviet Ruling Class (English translation Doubleday, 1984). Nicolas Werth, “Dekulakization as Mass Violence,” in The Black Book of Communism (Harvard University Press, 1999).

On information control as elite instrument: Walter Lippmann, Public Opinion (Harcourt Brace, 1922). Stuart Hall et al., Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order (Macmillan, 1978). Noam Chomsky and Edward Herman, Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media (Pantheon, 1988). On the ancient cases: John Baines and Norman Yoffee, “Order, Legitimacy, and Wealth in Ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia,” in Archaic States, ed. Gary Feinman and Joyce Marcus (School of American Research Press, 1998).

On Marx’s theory and its limits: Karl Marx, Capital, Volume I (1867; Penguin Classics translation, 1976). Marx and Engels, The German Ideology (written 1845–6; published posthumously). Marx, Critique of the Gotha Programme (1875). For the internal Marxist critique of power as independent variable, see Bakunin’s writings on the First International, particularly “On the International Workingmen’s Association and Karl Marx” (1872), in Bakunin on Anarchy, ed. Sam Dolgoff (Knopf, 1972).

Research and essay composition by Claude/Anthropic

Copyright and Licensing

© 2026 Thomas J. Bryan

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.
To view a copy of this license, visit: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

You are free to:
- Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format
- Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material

Under the following terms:
- Attribution — You must give appropriate credit
- NonCommercial — You may not use the material for commercial purposes

This case study is part of the collection *Patterns of Power: Systematic Analysis of Elite Control Mechanisms Across Civilizations*